

RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
City Clerk's Conference Room, 1st Floor, City Hall
400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada
CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTERNET ADDRESS: <http://www.ci.las-vegas.nv.us>

September 20, 2002
1:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER: City Clerk Ronemus called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

ATTENDANCE: Barbara Jo (Roni) Ronemus, City Clerk
Steve Houchens, Deputy City Manager (arrived 1:51 p.m.)
John Redlein, Assistant City Attorney
Mark Vincent, Director, Finance & Business Services
Joseph Marcella, Director, Information Technologies (excused 2:34 p.m.)
Richard Goecke, Director, Public Works (excused)
Radford Snelding, City Auditor
Sharon Kuhns, Records Administrator
Donna Willey, Administrative Secretary

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE RE COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN MEETING LAW - Meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Las Vegas-Clark County Library District, 833 N. Las Vegas Boulevard
Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road
Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy
Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall Plaza
City Hall Plaza, Posting Bulletin Board

(1:40)
1-1

NOTE: Chair Ronemus advised the Committee that effective September 20, 2002, City Manager Doug Selby has appointed Deputy City Manager Steve Houchens to take his place as Vice Chairman of the Records Management Committee. This memo will be made a part of the final minutes.

BUSINESS:

A. APPROVAL OF FINAL MINUTES BY REFERENCE OF THE RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING OF AUGUST 16, 2002

MARCELLA - Motion to APPROVE – VINCENT seconded the motion – UNANIMOUS

(1:40 – 1:41)
1-42

**B. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RECORDS DESTRUCTION
AUTHORIZATION FORM**

REDLEIN - Motion to PRELIMINARILY APPROVE the form, make changes as recommended today and ABEY to October 18, 2002 – VINCENT - seconded the motion – UNANIMOUS

Chair Ronemus distributed copies of the Records Destruction Authorization Form to the Committee for review and stated that the suggested changes from the last meeting were incorporated. It has been brought to her attention that this form is not only an authorization to destroy, but also an authorization to dispose of records, and asked if the Committee wanted to change verbiage. Assistant City Attorney Redlein suggested keeping it plain. It is an authorization for the destruction of records. Chair Ronemus substituted "certification" with "reviewer." Assistant City Attorney Redlein said that the signature captions should conform. It should be "submitted by" and "reviewed by" or "submitter" and "reviewer." Under the Records Listing section, Chair Ronemus included the following sentence, "The Records Administrator has reviewed the submitted listing and made the following findings." Assistant City Attorney Redlein suggested, "The Records Administrator has reviewed this request and made the following findings," with one signature line at the bottom. This form is submitted in duplicate and the Records Administrator keeps the original signature.

Assistant City Attorney Redlein expressed concern about the Records Administrator having to check each and every request. Ms. Kuhns explained that it is necessary to review them all. Chair Ronemus concurred, as this review will show if anyone is in need of training. The Committee concurred that the division manager is the appropriate level to approve as the reviewer. If a department has many divisions, the approval would be the responsibility of the deputy director or the director. Ms. Kuhns stated that the Department of Public Works has 34 Records Delegates.

Chair Ronemus noted that a new column is necessary for different types of media and that the form will be revised to reflect this. It has been decided that the column title should be P, E and M, which is Paper, Electronic and Microform. This form will be finalized for the next Records Management Committee meeting, October 18, 2002.

Deputy City Manager Houchens asked if a request for authorization is denied, does the process start all over. Ms. Kuhns explained that it would be approved, unless it was a permanent record or had a legal, historical or audit hold.

There was no further discussion.

(1:41 – 1:58)

C. DISCUSSION ON REVISIONS TO THE R-145-2001 WITH MARK VINCENT

Mr. Vincent stated that Purchasing and Contracts is considering revisions to simplify the resolution. The intent is to deal with the need for the City Clerk to attest to signatures on contracts as well as the Clerk maintaining a copy of the record. Assistant City Attorney Redlein commented when a manager or director exercises the authority that this resolution gives and modifies a Council contract, it must be attested and retained by the City Clerk. Chair Ronemus asked about contracts that do not go before the City Council. Mr. Vincent stated that it became apparent that the Clerk should be the primary record holder of all of those documents, to include contracts under \$25,000 that do not go before Council.

Assistant City Attorney Redlein noted that it is addressed in the resolution that modifications of non-Council contracts do not require a resolution for the manager to sign. If a modification involves more money, then there is no authority by resolution. Mr. Vincent asked if there were a contract for only \$10,000, would that manager's signature need to be attested. If it does, it would have to go to the Clerk, so it may as well remain there as record. Assistant City Attorney Redlein stated that if an original contract under \$25,000 ends up in the Clerk's office, then all amendments would have to as well. An official file should be complete. He also stated that whether or not the Clerk gets contracts under \$25,000 is not an issue that should be covered in this resolution. Mr. Vincent explained that it was just a topic of discussion. It seems easier to have all contracts in one place.

Chair Ronemus reminded the Committee that Mr. Goecke expressed concern regarding Public Works contracts not being kept in Public Works. Mr. Vincent stated that it is conceivable that in one particular project you might have contracts that are over and under \$25,000. In that case, you would have to go to two different places to see one complete file. Deputy City Manager Houchens asked Chair Ronemus if she attests to all contracts. She answered in the affirmative, as long as the document makes it to the Clerk's office. Mr. Snelding declared that the easiest way would be to have the document go to the department that it is signed in, unless it is covered by the \$25,000 rule. In that case, it would go to the Clerk. The department would be the one to do any modifications or change orders. Mr. Vincent commented that if a modification were over \$25,000, it would go before Council and then to the Clerk. The file is not complete because the Clerk does not have the original documents. Mr. Snelding stated that it would have to be the responsibility of the department to see that it gets to the Clerk. Chair Ronemus noted that this would have to be procedure.

Mr. Marcella affirmed that if the decision were made at the department level, it would be made inconsistently. If the amount of the contracts written on an annual basis is not prohibitive, then all of them should be in a central repository. Mr. Snelding stated that there were approximately 600 performance contracts over two years and the majority would be under \$25,000. Chair Ronemus stated that once this issue is resolved, it will become a training issue for the Records Delegates.

Mr. Snelding suggested a policy that says if you enter into a contract, you have to maintain it. Ms. Kuhns stated that now the Committee is back to the dollar amounts being taken off of the OPR list and the signing authority added. Chair Ronemus suggested both. Mr. Vincent stated that the signing authority is consistent with the dollar threshold with the exception of Public Works because they handle all of their own professional services contracts.

Mr. Snelding noted that Mr. Vincent has a matrix that shows who has responsibility for certain parts of contracts. Maybe this matrix can be modified to suit the needs of Records Management. Mr. Vincent acknowledged that a schedule was created based upon this matrix that showed the dollar threshold, the type of contract, and the signature authority.

Mr. Vincent stated that there is no need to place this item on a future agenda. Chair Ronemus asked him to keep the Committee apprised as he goes forward with this issue.

There was no further discussion.

(1:58 - 2:34)

1 – 581

D. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE REVISION TO OPR (OFFICE OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY) LISTING

Chair Ronemus stated that the previous discussion on item C incorporated item D.

There was no further discussion.

(2:34 – 2:35)

1-1904

E. REPORT AND UPDATE ON RECORDS STORAGE FACILITY SURVEY RESULTS

Ms. Kuhns advised the Committee that the total of the square footage increased since the survey given in June. Previously, it was 7,587 sq. ft. with a total number of boxes at 3,114. The Municipal Court inventory figures made a tremendous increase. Muni Court is also spending a lot of money on outside storage. They will soon be moving to the Regional Justice Center where there is no room for 7,000 boxes. This will increase their cost for commercial storage due to the fact that a records storage facility will not be built in that time frame. They were happy to hear of the direction that the City is taking and want to participate.

Ms. Kuhns stated that the State Court Administrator of the Supreme Court must authorize Muni Courts records destruction. It is written into their retention schedule. Muni Court's Records Delegate contacted the Court Administrator of the Supreme Court to find out when the last time records were authorized for destruction. That answer has not been provided. Assistant City Attorney Redlein stated that there are rules on how long to keep closed case files. Ms. Kuhns noted that Mr. James Carmany, Municipal Court Administrator, wants to address public records access and confidential records. She also advised the Committee that NAC 239 does not apply to Muni Court.

Ms. Kuhns affirmed that with Muni Court's numbers, the proposed 10,000 square foot facility would be full as soon as they moved in, but they will be on a destruction cycle prior to moving. Chair Ronemus asked about temporary storage in the jail. Deputy City Manager Houchens said that he would check on that possibility.

There was no further discussion.

(2:35 – 2:42)

1-1943

F. INFORMATIONAL MATTERS FOR FUTURE RECORDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AGENDAS

None.

(2:42 – 2:43)

1-2287

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:

None.

ADJOURNED:

SNELDING - Motion to ADJOURN – VINCENT - seconded the motion – UNANIMOUS

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

/dw